Endofunctors Modelling Higher-Order Behaviours

Marco Peressotti

Laboratory of Models and Applications of Distributed Systems,
Department of Mathematics, Computer Science and Physics
University of Udine, Italy

marco.peressotti@uniud.it

arXiv:1602.06221v2 [cs.LO] 11 Jul 2016

Abstract

In this paper we show how the abstract behaviours of higher-order systems can be modelled as *final coalgebras* of suitable *behavioural functors*. These functors have the challenging peculiarity to be circularly defined with their own final coalgebra. Our main contribution is a general construction for defining these functors, solving this circularity which is the essence of higher-order behaviours. This characterisation is *syntax agnostic*. To achieve this property, we shift from term passing to *behaviour passing*: in the former higher-order is expressed by passing around syntactic objects–such as terms or processes–as representations of behaviours whereas the former ditches the syntactic encoding altogether and works directly with behaviours *i.e.* semantic objects. From this perspective, the former can be seen as syntactic higher-order whereas the latter as *semantic higher-order*.

1. Introduction

It is well known that *higher-order systems*, *i.e.* systems which can pass around systems of the same kind, like the λ-calculus [1, 4], the calculus of higher-order communicating systems (CHOCS) [39], the higher-order π-calculus (HOπ) [31], HOcore [24], *etc.*, are difficult to reason about. Many bisimulations and proof methods have been proposed also in recent works [5, 23, 25, 29, 32, 38]. This effort points out that a definition of *abstract* higher-order behaviour is still elusive. In this paper, we show how these abstract behaviours can be modelled as the *final coalgebras* of suitable *higher-order behavioural functors*.

Coalgebras are a well established framework for modelling and studying concurrent and reactive systems [30]. In this approach, we first define a *behavioural endofunctor* B over **Set** (or other suitable category), modelling the computational aspect under scrutiny; for X a set of states, $\mathsf{B}X$ is the type of behaviours over X. Then, a system over X corresponds to a B-coalgebra, *i.e.* a map $h\colon X \to \mathsf{B}X$ associating each state with its behaviour. The crucial step of this approach is defining the functor B, as it corresponds to specify the behaviours that the systems are meant to exhibit. Once we have defined a behavioural functor, many important properties and general results can be readily instantiated, such as the existence of the *final* B*-coalgebra* (containing all abstract behaviours), the definition of the canonical *coalgebraic bisimulation* (which is the abstract generalization of Milner's strong bisimilarity) and its coincidence with behavioural equivalence [2], the construction of canonical *trace semantics* [17] and *weak bisimulations* [6], the notion of *abstract GSOS* [21, 40], *etc*. We stress the fact that behavioural functors are "syntax agnostic": they define the semantic behaviours, abstracting from any specific concrete representation of systems. In the wake of these important results, many functors have been defined for modelling a wide range of behaviours: deterministic and non-deterministic systems [30]; systems with I/O, with names, with resources [12, 13]; systems with quantitative aspects such as probabilities [10, 22, 27, 28, 37]; systems with continuous states [3], *etc*.

Despite these results, a general coalgebraic treatment of higher-order systems is still missing. In fact, defining endofunctors for higher-order behaviours is challenging. In order to describe the problem, let us consider first an endofunctor over **Set** for representing the behaviour of a first-order calculus, like CCS with value passing [18]:

$$\mathsf{B} = \mathcal{P}_\omega(\mathsf{C} \times V \times \mathrm{Id} + \mathsf{C} \times \mathrm{Id}^V + \mathrm{Id}) \tag{1}$$

where C is a set of channels and V is the set of values [13]. This functor is well-defined, and it admits a final coalgebra which we denote by $\nu\mathsf{B}$; the carrier of this coalgebra is the set $|\nu\mathsf{B}|$ containing *all possible (abstract) behaviours*, *i.e.*, synchronization trees labelled with nothing (τ-actions), input or output actions.

In a higher-order calculus like HOπ, the values that processes can communicate are processes themselves. However, actions communicating semantically equivalent (herein, strongly bisimilar) processes have to be considered equivalent even if the values/processes exchanged are syntactically different. In other words, this means that from the semantics perspective higher-order behaviours communicate *behaviours*. To reflect this fundamental observation in the definition (1) we must replace the set of exchanged values V with the set of all possible behaviours *i.e.* the carrier of the final B-coalgebra yielding the following definition:

$$\mathsf{B}_{\mathtt{ho}} = \mathcal{P}_\omega(\mathsf{C} \times |\nu\mathsf{B}_{\mathtt{ho}}| \times \mathrm{Id} + \mathsf{C} \times \mathrm{Id}^{|\nu\mathsf{B}_{\mathtt{ho}}|} + \mathrm{Id}) \tag{2}$$

But this means that we are defining $\mathsf{B}_{\mathtt{ho}}$ using its own final coalgebra $\nu\mathsf{B}_{\mathtt{ho}}$, which can be defined (if it exists) only after $\mathsf{B}_{\mathtt{ho}}$ is defined—a circularity!

We think that this circularity is the gist of higher-order behaviours: any attempt to escape it would be restricting and distorting. One may be tempted to take as V some (syntactic) representation of behaviours (*e.g.*, processes), but this would fall short. First, the resulting behaviours would not be really higher-order, but rather behaviours manipulating some *ad hoc* representation of behaviours. Secondly, we would need some mechanism for moving between behaviours and their representations–which would hardly be complete. Third, the resulting functor would not be abstract and independent from the syntax of processes, thus hindering the possibility of reasoning about the computational aspect on its own, and comparing different models sharing the same kind of behaviour.

This fundamental shift from *term/process passing* to *behaviour passing* is at the hearth of this work and introduces a distinction between syntactic and semantic higher-order. Intuitively, for fully-abstract calculi this means that instead of restricting to systems unable to distinguish between bisimilar processes, we exchange collections of bisimilar processes/terms. This frees us from the hurdle of finding complete syntactic representations and canonical representatives. To some extent, this approach follows the idea of Sangiorgi's *environmental bisimulation* [32] where bisimulation relations are indexed by approximations of the bisimilarity relation used in place of syntactic equivalence during the bisimulation game.

The main contribution of this paper is a general characterisation endofunctors modelling higher-order operational behaviours in terms of solutions to certain recursive equations. We complement this result providing a categorical construction for finding solutions to these equations while dealing with the unavoidable circularity mentioned above. The key idea is to consider the definition as an instance of an endofunctor $\mathfrak{F}(V)\colon \mathbf{Set} \to \mathbf{Set}$ parameterised in the object of values V. Then, we are interested in those instances whose final coalgebra is carried by the object of values *i.e.* those such that values are exactly all (abstract) behaviours. Actually, since this parameter may occur in both covariant and contravariant position, the functor is *biparametric*. In our example, $\mathfrak{F}\colon \mathbf{Set}^{op} \times \mathbf{Set} \to [\mathbf{Set}, \mathbf{Set}]$ is given as:

$$\mathfrak{F}(X, Y) = \mathcal{P}_\omega(C \times Y \times Id + C \times Id^X + Id) \tag{3}$$

where $[\mathbf{Set}, \mathbf{Set}]$ denotes the category of endofunctors over **Set**. In general, we consider functors $\mathfrak{F}\colon \mathbf{C}^{op} \times \mathbf{C} \to [\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{C}]$ (eventually $\mathfrak{F}\colon \mathbf{D}^{op} \times \mathbf{D} \to [\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{C}]$) and show how to define an initial sequence of endofunctors together with their final coalgebras such that its limit $(B, |\nu B|)$ exists and satisfies:

$$B \cong \mathfrak{F}(|\nu B|, |\nu B|).$$

Thus, B is the requested higher-order behavioural functor.

A consequence of this construction is that we can now apply standard results and techniques offered by the coalgebraic framework and *e.g.*, derive a canonical higher-order bisimulation as an instance of Aczel-Mendler's coalgebraic bisimulation. Likewise, we can derive SOS specifications by instantiating the bialgebraic framework thus accommodating syntactic representations (*e.g.* processes) in our settings.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows: Section 2 contains preliminaries on order-enriched categories and algebraic compactness. Section 3 provides an abstract characterisation of endofunctors modelling higher-order behaviours and a construction for computing them levering algebraic compactness. Section 4 refines and generalises this construction with the relevant (albeit technical) benefit of reducing the parts where algebraic compactness is assumed. Section 5 contains some concluding remarks and directions for further work.

2. Preliminaries on algebraic compactness

In this section we recall preliminary notions and results relevant relevant to the constructions described in the following sections. In particular, we need a form of *limit-colimit coincidence* [34] developed in the field of (categorical) domain theory in order to guarantee the existence of (unique dominating) solutions to equations with unknowns occurring in both covariant and contravariant position.

Let **Cpo** be the category whose objects are (small) ω-complete partial orders and whose morphisms are continuous maps and let $\mathbf{Cpo}_\perp$ be its subcategory whose objects have bottoms and whose morphisms are bottom-strict.

A **Cpo**-*enriched category* (or simply **Cpo**-category) $\mathbf{C}$ is a locally small category whose hom-sets $\mathbf{C}(X, Y)$ come equipped with an ω-complete partial order $\leqslant_{X,Y}$ such that composition $(- \circ -)\colon \mathbf{C}(Y, Z) \times \mathbf{C}(X, Y) \to \mathbf{C}(X, Z)$ is a continuous operation. A special case of **Cpo**-categories are those enriched over $\mathbf{Cpo}_\perp$ *i.e.* any **Cpo**-category $\mathbf{C}$ whose hom-sets $\mathbf{C}(X, Y)$ are additionally equipped with a bottom element $\perp_{X,Y}$ and whose composition operation is strict. We shall drop subscripts from $\leqslant_{X,Y}$ and $\perp_{X,Y}$ when possible. We denote the category underlying a **Cpo**-category $\mathbf{C}$ as $\lfloor \mathbf{C} \rfloor$ or just as $\mathbf{C}$ when clear from the context.

In the following let $\mathbf{V}$ stand for either **Cpo** or $\mathbf{Cpo}_\perp$.

Example 2.1. The category $\mathbf{V}$ is enriched over itself. The single object category $\mathbf{1}$ is trivially $\mathbf{Cpo}_\perp$-enriched. The dual of a $\mathbf{V}$-category $\mathbf{C}$ is the $\mathbf{V}$-category $\mathbf{C}^{op}$ such that $obj(\mathbf{C}^{op}) = obj(\mathbf{C})$ and $\mathbf{C}^{op}(X, Y) = \mathbf{C}(Y, X)$. The product of $\mathbf{V}$-categories $\mathbf{C}$ and $\mathbf{D}$ is the $\mathbf{V}$-category $\mathbf{C} \times \mathbf{D}$ such that $(\mathbf{C} \times \mathbf{D})((X, X'), (Y, Y')) = \mathbf{C}(X, Y) \times \mathbf{D}(X', Y')$. The category of relations $\mathbf{Rel} \cong \mathcal{K}l(\mathcal{P})$ is a $\mathbf{Cpo}_\perp$-category where the order structure is defined by pointwise extension of the inclusion order created by the powerset monad—see *e.g.* [6,17] for more behavioural functors of endowed with monadic structures yielding $\mathbf{V}$-enriched Kleisli categories.

A $\mathbf{V}$-*enriched functor* $F\colon \mathbf{C} \to \mathbf{D}$ between $\mathbf{V}$-categories is a functorial mapping such that for every pair of objects X, Y in $\mathbf{C}$ the assignment $F_{X,Y}\colon \mathbf{C}(X, Y) \to \mathbf{D}(FX, FY)$ is continuous and, in the case of $\mathbf{Cpo}_\perp$-functors, strict. Unless otherwise stated, we implicitly assume that domain and codomain of an enriched functor are similarly enriched. We shall denote the functor underlying a $\mathbf{V}$-functor $F\colon \mathbf{C} \to \mathbf{D}$ as $\lfloor F \rfloor\colon \lfloor \mathbf{C} \rfloor \to \lfloor \mathbf{D} \rfloor$ or simply F, when confusion seems unlikely. For $\mathbf{V}$-categories $\mathbf{C}$ and $\mathbf{D}$, the functor category $[\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{D}]$ is the $\mathbf{V}$-category whose objects are $\mathbf{V}$-functors and such that $[\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{D}](X, Y)$ is the complete partial order on the set $\mathbf{Nat}(X, Y)$ of natural transformations given by pointwise extension of the order on their components. Categories and functors enriched over $\mathbf{V}$ form the category $\mathbf{V}$-**Cat**. A **Cpo**-*adjunction* $\chi\colon L \vdash R\colon \mathbf{C} \to \mathbf{D}$ is given by a natural isomorphism

$$\chi\colon \mathbf{C}(L-, -) \cong \mathbf{D}(-, R-)\colon \mathbf{D}^{op} \times \mathbf{C} \to \mathbf{Pos}.$$

Actually, the above statement defines a **Pos**-adjunction but, since the inclusion functor $\mathbf{Cpo} \to \mathbf{Pos}$ creates isomorphisms, any **Pos**-adjunction involving **Cpo**-categories yields a **Cpo**-adjunction.

Two morphisms $e\colon X \to Y$ and $p\colon Y \to X$ in a **Cpo**-category $\mathbf{C}$ form an *embedding-projection pair* (written $e \lhd p\colon X \to Y$) whenever $p \circ e = id_X$ and $e \circ p \leqslant id_Y$ or, diagrammatically:



The components e and p are called *embedding* (of X in Y) and *projection* of (Y in X), respectively, and uniquely determine each other. Since complete partial orders are small categories, embedding-projection pairs are *coreflections*;[1] henceforth we use the two terms interchangeably in the context of **Cpo**-categories.

Coreflections in a **Cpo**-category $\mathbf{C}$ form a sub-**Cpo**-category of $\mathbf{C}$ whose objects are those of $\mathbf{C}$ and whose arrows are embedding-projections with the order on hom-sets given by the ordering on the embeddings (note that $e \leqslant e' \iff p \geqslant p'$). We shall write $\mathbf{C}^\lhd$ for such category. By forgetting either the projection or embedding part of a coreflection we get the categories $\mathbf{C}^e$ and $\mathbf{C}^p$ (of embeddings and projections), respectively, and such that $\mathbf{C}^e \cong \mathbf{C}^\lhd \cong (\mathbf{C}^p)^{op}$.

Proposition 2.2 (Limit-colimit coincidence)**.** *Assume* $\mathbf{C}$ *enriched over the category* **Cpo**. *For an* ω*-chain of coreflections* $(e_n \lhd p_n\colon X_n \to X_{n+1})_{n<\omega}$ *and a cone of coreflections* $(f_n \lhd q_n\colon X \to X_n)_{n<\omega}$ *for it the following are equivalent:*

1. *the cocone* $(f_n\colon X \to X_n)_{n<\omega}$ *is a colimit for the embeddings chain* $(e_n\colon X_n \to X_{n+1})_{n<\omega}$.
2. *the cone* $(q_n\colon X_n \to X)_{n<\omega}$ *is a limit for the projections chain* $(p_n\colon X_{n+1} \to X_n)_{n<\omega}$.

The above is a slight reformulation of the limit-colimit coincidence result used in [36] to solve recursive domain equations with

[1] A coreflection is an adjunction whose unit is a pseudo-cell.

unknowns occurring in covariant and contravariant positions like the well-known domain equation:

$$D \cong (D \to D) + At.$$

In [14] Peter J. Freyd introduced the concept of *algebraically compact* categories as an abstract context where to address mixed variance. These categories are characterised by a limit-colimit coincidence property for initial/final sequences of endofunctors in a given class *e.g.* **Cpo**-endofunctors as in the definition below.

Definition 2.3. A **Cpo**-category is **Cpo**-*algebraically complete* [14] whenever every **Cpo**-endofunctor on it has an initial algebra. Dually, a **Cpo**-category is **Cpo**-coalgebraically cocomplete whenever every **Cpo**-endofunctor on it has a final coalgebra. A **Cpo**-category (resp. $\mathbf{Cpo}_\perp$-category) is **Cpo**-*algebraically compact* [14] if every **Cpo**-functor has an initial algebra and a final coalgebra and they are canonically isomorphic.

Proposition 2.4. *The following hold true:*

1. *[11] A* **Cpo**-*category with an embedding-initial object and colimits of ω-chains of embeddings is* **Cpo**-*algebraically complete.*
2. *[15] A* **Cpo**-*algebraically complete* $\mathbf{Cpo}_\perp$-*enriched category is* **Cpo**-*algebraically compact.*

The class of **Cpo**-algebraically compact categories is closed under products and duals.

Corollary 2.5. *Assume* **C** *and* **D** **Cpo**-*algebraically compact,* $\mathbf{C}^{op}$ *and* $\mathbf{C} \times \mathbf{D}$ *are* **Cpo**-*algebraically compact.*

In particular, if **C** is **Cpo**-algebraically compact then so is its free involutory category $\mathbf{C}^{op} \times \mathbf{C}$.

Remark 2.6. Algebraic compactness is at the core of several works on categorical domain theory, especially by Marcelo Fiore [11] who refined and extended the theory. We restricted ourselves to **Cpo**-algebraic compactness in order to simplify the exposition but results presented in this work can be formulated in the general setting of pseudo-algebraically compact 2-categories [8].

3. Higher-order operational behaviours via behaviour passing

In this Section we present the main contribution of our paper: a coalgebraic characterisation of higher-order behaviours. In Section 3.1 we review the process passing approach and discuss its shortcomings when it is applied in the context of coalgebras. This lead us to propose the behaviour passing approach which yield an abstract and syntax-agnostic notion of functors that model higher-order behaviours. We characterise these higher-order behavioural endofunctors as solutions to suitable recursive equations. In Section 3.2 we study the problem of finding such solutions: the key idea is to obtain them as limits of specific sequences. Fundamental to this result is limit-colimit coincidence result recalled in Section 2 which thus prompts us to work in **Cpo**-enriched settings. Solutions obtained in this way define higher-order behavioural functors back in the "non-enriched" settings. In Section 3.3 we discuss some illustrative examples.

3.1. Characterising higher-order behaviours

We abstract a family of endofunctors modelling value passing behaviours such as (1) as a functor:

$$\mathfrak{F} \colon \mathbf{C}^{op} \times \mathbf{C} \to [\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{C}].$$

Herein we shall refer to functors of this type as *behaviour families* and say that a behavioural endofunctor B *belongs* to a family $\mathfrak{F}$ whenever $B \cong \mathfrak{F}(V, W)$ for some $V, W \in \mathbf{C}$.

Remark 3.1. The above definition could (and will) be generalised to allow parameters to range over categories different than the category **C** over which endofunctors in the family are defined. In the context this work, the case of functors of type $\mathbf{D}^{op} \times \mathbf{D} \to [\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{C}]$ requires some additional technical attention and therefore it will be covered separately in Section 4

For the sake of simplicity, let us consider as a running example the functor $\mathfrak{F}(V, W) = Id^V + W$ over **Set**. A system modelled by a coalgebra for $Id^V + W$ can, at each step, either input an element of V or terminate producing an element of W. Fix a set P of processes[2]. Coalgebras of type $\mathfrak{F}(P, P)$ model systems whose inputs and outputs are processes and the corresponding notion coalgebraic bisimulation is instantiates as follows:

Definition 3.2. For a pair of $(Id^P + P)$-coalgebras, a relation R between their carrier sets is a bisimulation if, and only if, $(x, y) \in R$ implies that:

- if $x \xrightarrow{p} x'$ then $y \xrightarrow{p} y'$ and $(x', y') \in R$;
- if $x \to p$ then $y \to p$;
- the symmetric of the above conditions.

Endofunctors in a $\mathfrak{F}$ model behaviours passing values from given sets without assuming any additional structure (*e.g.* a semantic equivalence) and consequently what were meant to be processes are indeed plain values in the above definition and, likewise, any coalgebraic construction instantiated on these functors. To exemplify this issue consider the coalgebra $h \colon P \to P^P + P$ given by $h(p) = in_r(p)$ where in_r denotes the coproduct right injection. Although h is carried by the set of processes P, we do not require it to coincide with the dynamics assumed for the processes in P. The coalgebra h describes processes that promptly terminate returning themselves as their output value—a rather limited dynamics—but, since the outputs are distinct elements of P, the greatest bisimulation is the identity relation: Assume $R \subseteq P \times P$, if $(x, y) \in R$ then $h(x) = in_r(x)$ is equal to $h(y) = in_r(y)$ and hence $x = y$. Coalgebras of type $\mathfrak{F}(P, P)$ describe systems that can react to inputs regardless of semantics equivalence: they can distinguish processes meant to be behaviourally indistinguishable. For instance, consider a context $C[-]$ such that $C[p] \to p$ for any $p \in P$, if $r \neq s$ then $r \sim s \not\Rightarrow C[r] \sim C[s]$ since $C[r] \to r$ and $C[s] \to s$. From these examples it is clear that Definition 3.2 does not capture the intuitive semantics equivalence, unless the later is the identity on P, which is not in many higher-order calculi.

Approaches found in the literature revolve around two main strategies. The first is to restrict to the subclass of coalgebras that do not distinguish inputs and outputs that are meant to be semantically equivalent. Unfortunately, this hinders many of the valuable results offered by the coalgebraic approach: for starters, the final coalgebra is not among them. In fact, the final coalgebra for $Id^C + D$ is the set of all possibly unlimited C-branching trees whose leaves are labelled with elements in D. We mention [20] as an example of this approach. The second is to provide an *ad hoc* definition of bisimulation where values are compared using a suitable equivalence relation. This is the idea behind several process-passing calculi such as CHOCS [39] or HOπ [31] and–albeit mixed with other techniques–constitute the core of environmental bisimulation [32]. Guided by these examples, Definition 3.2 can be adapted to consider values up-to some given equivalence $\approx$ as follows:

[2]The core ideas of the following reasoning would be unaffected if an algebra of terms were to be used.

Definition 3.3. Let $\approx \subseteq P \times P$ be an equivalence relation. A relation R between the carrier sets of two $\mathfrak{F}(P,P)$-coalgebras is a $\approx$-bisimulation if, and only if, $(x,y) \in R$ implies that:

- if $x \xrightarrow{p} x'$ and $p \approx q$ then $y \xrightarrow{q} y'$ and $(x',y') \in R$
- if $x \to p$ then $y \to q$ and $p \approx q$;
- the symmetric of the above conditions.

We remark that Definition 3.3 applies to any equivalence relation over P regardless of its coherence with respect to process semantics. To this end, we need to assume $\approx$ to be the greatest $\approx$-bisimulation for processes under the chosen dynamics. Reworded, the definition of processes, their dynamics, and bisimulation depend on each other.

Assuming a suitable $\approx$ exists, $\approx$-bisimulation does not coincide with coalgebraic bisimulation for $\mathfrak{F}(P,P)$-coalgebras unless we restrict to those that can be seen as $\mathfrak{F}(P/\approx, P/\approx)$-coalgebras *i.e.* systems that "handle bisimilar processes in bisimilar ways".

Lemma 3.4. *A relation R is a $\approx$-bisimulation if, and only if, it is an $\mathfrak{F}(P/\approx, P/\approx)$-bisimulation.*

Proof (sketch). For brevity we consider bisimulations on single systems. Let R be a $\approx$-bisimulation for some coalgebra h and define $\overline{h}\colon X/R \to \mathfrak{F}(P/\approx, P/\approx)(X/R)$ as:

$$\overline{h}([x]_R) \triangleq \begin{cases} \lambda[p]_\approx.[\phi(p)]_R & \text{if } g(x) = in_l(\phi) \\ [p]_\approx & \text{if } g(x) = in_r(p) \end{cases}.$$

The coalgebra $\overline{h}$ is well-defined for R is an $\approx$-bisimulation. The implication in the other direction is trivial since $\approx$ is an equivalence and **Set** has regular epimorphisms. □

Remark 3.5. Intuitively, dimmed bisimulation [9] compares labelled actions up-to some given equivalence relation that "dims the light used to distinguish labels" in order to simplify the automated verification of some properties of stochastic systems. Definition 3.3 can be seen an extension of dimmed bisimulation to systems with input and output actions. In fact, Lemma 3.4 and its proof readily translate to the setting of [9].

Lemma 3.4 suggests that in order to use coalgebraic bisimulation we have to consider classes of processes with the same semantics instead of plain processes. Further evidence supporting this intuition comes from the fact that bisimulation notions for higher-order calculi found in the literature are usually based on some sort of semantically induced quotient of the process set (*cf.* [23, 31, 32, 39]) and, *mutatis mutandis*, this holds also for approaches based on normal forms. Nonetheless, a subtle issue remains unresolved: P may not be expressive enough to describe *all possible behaviours*. In other words, there might be systems whose behaviour is modelled by some $\mathfrak{F}(P,P)$-coalgebra but cannot be used as a value whereas higher-order systems are though as operating on systems of the same kind. Under the light of these observations we propose the use of abstract behaviours instead of processes; formally:

Definition 3.6. For $\mathfrak{F}\colon \mathbf{C}^{op} \times \mathbf{C} \to [\mathbf{C},\mathbf{C}]$, an endofunctor B in $\mathfrak{F}$ is said to characterise higher-order behaviours if and only if:

$$B \cong \mathfrak{F}(|\nu B|, |\nu B|). \tag{4}$$

Definition 3.6 embraces the inherent circularity of higher-order capturing this defining property in the behavioural functor itself instead of imposing restrictions on the systems considered or requiring *ad hoc* notions of bisimulation. This approach offers the following key advantages:

1. Values are canonically defined in a way that is independent from any syntactic representation of behaviours whereas in the process passing approach it is not as clear how processes and their dynamics are given.
2. The semantic equivalence on values (*cf.* $\approx$) is bisimilarity and, by strong extensionality of final coalgebras, it coincides with the identity relation which in turn allows us to apply standard coalgebraic results, like coinductive proof methods.
3. All behaviours are represented, by definition of final semantics.

Note that in general there are no guarantees about the number of solutions to (4): there may be exactly one, more than one, or even none. For instance, all endofunctors considered in the above examples admit final coalgebras but none satisfies (4).

3.2. Existence and construction

In this subsection we propose a categorical construction for finding solutions to the equation (4) and hence for finding endofunctors modelling higher-order behaviours. In particular, solutions are obtained as fixed points of endofunctors over algebraically compact categories where compactness is due to the unknown in (4) occurring both in covariant and contravariant positions as well. Henceforth, we assume $\mathfrak{F}\colon \mathbf{C}^{op} \times \mathbf{C} \to [\mathbf{C},\mathbf{C}]$ to be **Cpo**-enriched.

The first step towards rephrasing (4) in the language of **Cpo**-functors is to define a **Cpo**-functor $|\nu -|$ assigning endofunctors over a **Cpo**-coalgebraically cocomplete category to the object carrying their final coalgebra.

Lemma 3.7. *Assume $\mathbf{C}$ **Cpo**-coalgebraically cocomplete. Any family of assignments $\{G \mapsto |\nu G|\}_{G \in [\mathbf{C},\mathbf{C}]}$ extends to a **Cpo**-enriched functor $|\nu -|\colon [\mathbf{C},\mathbf{C}] \to \mathbf{C}$.*

Proof. On objects, the functor is defined by the given assignment. Each transformation $\phi \in [\mathbf{C},\mathbf{C}](F,G)$ defines a G-coalgebra on the carrier of the final F-coalgebra:

$$|\nu F| \xrightarrow{\nu F} F|\nu F| \xrightarrow{\phi_{|\nu F|}} G|\nu F|$$

whose coinductive extension to the final G-coalgebra (which exists by **Cpo**-coalgebraic cocompleteness) defines the action $|\nu\phi|$. It is easy to see that the assignment is functorial and continuous, (by naturality and enrichment, respectively) completing the proof. □

For exposition sake, let us assume a chosen assignment and thus fix $|\nu -|$. We remark that this mild assumption can be avoided by carrying out the constructions below in the (more technically involved) pseudo setting.

For a **Cpo**-functor $\mathfrak{F}\colon \mathbf{C}^{op} \times \mathbf{C} \to [\mathbf{C},\mathbf{C}]$, let $\mathfrak{F}_\nu$ denote:

$$[\mathbf{C},\mathbf{C}]^{op} \times [\mathbf{C},\mathbf{C}] \xrightarrow{|\nu -|^{op} \times |\nu -|} \mathbf{C}^{op} \times \mathbf{C} \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{F}} [C, C]$$

which clearly corresponds to the right hand of (4). From $\mathfrak{F}_\nu$ define the symmetric endofunctor $\breve{\mathfrak{F}}_\nu$:

$$[\mathbf{C},\mathbf{C}]^{op} \times [\mathbf{C},\mathbf{C}] \xrightarrow{\langle \mathfrak{F}_\nu^{op} \circ \gamma, \mathfrak{F}_\nu \rangle} [\mathbf{C},\mathbf{C}]^{op} \times [\mathbf{C},\mathbf{C}]$$

where γ denotes the involution for $[\mathbf{C},\mathbf{C}]^{op} \times [\mathbf{C},\mathbf{C}]$ *i.e.* the isomorphism $[\mathbf{C},\mathbf{C}]^{op} \times [\mathbf{C},\mathbf{C}] \cong [\mathbf{C},\mathbf{C}] \times [\mathbf{C},\mathbf{C}]^{op}$–in the following we shall omit γ when clear from the context. Akin to the correspondence between $\mathfrak{F}_\nu$ and (4), $\breve{\mathfrak{F}}_\nu$ corresponds the system:

$$\begin{cases} B \cong \mathfrak{F}(|\nu D|, |\nu B|) \\ D \cong \mathfrak{F}^{op}(|\nu B|, |\nu D|) \end{cases}$$

whose solutions are all $\breve{\mathfrak{F}}_\nu$-invariant objects (*i.e.* fixed points).

Algebras for symmetric endofunctors like $\breve{\mathfrak{F}}_\nu$ are suitable pairs of algebras and coalgebras called dialgebras [16]. Whenever it exists, the initial algebra of a symmetric endofunctor determines the final coalgebra and *vice versa*. In fact, any invariant of a symmetric endofunctor determines a specular one by symmetry (just swap the values for the unknowns B and D). An invariant is isomorphic to its specular if, and only if, $B \cong D$ and these are all the solutions to (4) as illustrated by its reformulation:

$$\begin{cases} B \cong \mathfrak{F}(|\nu D|, |\nu B|) \\ D \cong \mathfrak{F}^{op}(|\nu B|, |\nu D|) \\ B \cong D \end{cases}$$

Note that initial and final invariants might not be isomorphic. Algebraic compactness ensures that they are. Moreover, any other invariant is *dominated* by the initial/final one in the sense that it factors the isomorphism between the initial and final invariants; in the **Cpo**-enriched setting this yields a coreflection from the dominating to the dominated solution.

It is not known whether the class of **Cpo**-algebraically compact categories is closed under exponentiation [11]; it remains an open question even if we restrict to the case of "self-exponentials" such as $[\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{C}]$. We mention from *loc. cit.* that algebraic compactness is preserved when the exponential base is $\mathbf{Cpo}_\perp$ or, in general, any *algebraically super-compact* category and refer the interested reader to [11] for further details.

Although we cannot state that if $\mathbf{C}$ is **Cpo**-algebraically compact so is $[\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{C}]$, a weaker result will isuffice for our aims. In fact, unlike arbitrary endofunctors over $[\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{C}]^{op} \times [\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{C}]$, $\breve{\mathfrak{F}}_\nu$ factors through the **Cpo**-algebraically compact category $\mathbf{C}^{op} \times \mathbf{C}$ as:

$$\breve{\mathfrak{F}}_\nu = \langle \mathfrak{F}_\nu^{op}, \mathfrak{F}_\nu \rangle \cong \langle \mathfrak{F}^{op}, \mathfrak{F} \rangle \circ (|\nu - |^{op} \times |\nu - |).$$

This observation suggests that we can equivalently look for solutions in $\mathbf{C}^{op} \times \mathbf{C}$—as formalised by Lemma 3.8 below.

For a $\mathbf{V}$-category $\mathbf{E}$ let $[\mathbf{E}, \mathbf{D}, \mathbf{E}]$ be the sub-$\mathbf{V}$-category of $[\mathbf{E}, \mathbf{E}]$ whose objects factor through $\mathbf{D}$. The category $\mathbf{E}$ is at least as algebraically compact with respect to $\mathbf{V}$-functors in $[\mathbf{E}, \mathbf{D}, \mathbf{E}]$ as $\mathbf{D}$ is with respect to $\mathbf{V}$-endofunctors in $[\mathbf{D}, \mathbf{D}]$.

Lemma 3.8. *For any* **Cpo***-category* $\mathbf{E}$ *and a* **Cpo***-endofunctor* $F \in [\mathbf{E}, \mathbf{D}, \mathbf{E}]$*, the following hold true:*

1. *If* $\mathbf{D}$ *is* **Cpo***-algebraically complete then,* F *has an initial algebra.*
2. *If* $\mathbf{D}$ *is* **Cpo***-coalgebraically cocomplete then,* F *has a final coalgebra.*
3. *If* $\mathbf{D}$ *is* **Cpo***-algebraically compact then,* F *has an initial algebra, a final coalgebra, and they are canonically isomorphic.*

Proof. By hypotheses there are $G : \mathbf{D} \to \mathbf{E}$ and $H : \mathbf{E} \to \mathbf{D}$ such that $F = G \circ H$. By **Cpo**-algebraic completeness of $\mathbf{D}$ the **Cpo**-endofunctor $H \circ G$ admits an initial algebra $h : HGX \to X$; therefore there is at least one F-invariant: $Gh : (GH)GX \to GX$. For an F-algebra $g : FY \to Y$ consider the HG-algebra Hg and let $x : X \to HY$ be its inductive extension. The morphism $g \circ Gx : GX \to Y$ in $\mathbf{E}$ defines an F-algebra morphism from Gh to g proving that the former is weakly initial. By initiality of $h : HGX \to X$, we have that $Hy = x \circ h$ for any algebra morphism $y : GX \to Y$ going from Gh to g and hence that:

$$Fy = GHy = G(x \circ h) = F(g \circ Gx) = G(Hg \circ x).$$

Since y and $g \circ Gx$ are F-algebra morphisms we have:

$$g \circ G(x \circ h) = F(g \circ Gx) = g \circ Fy = y \circ Gh$$

and hence $g \circ Gx \circ Gh$ is unique up-to the isomorphism Gh *i.e.* the chosen initial F-algebra. Dually, if $\mathbf{D}$ is **Cpo**-coalgebraically cocomplete then F has a final coalgebra. If $\mathbf{D}$ is **Cpo**-algebraically compact then the canonical isomorphism between the initial HG-algebra and the final HG-coalgebra yields a canonical isomorphism between the initial F-algebra and the final F-coalgebra. □


1 ⟵ 1 ⟵ 1 ⟵ ⋯ 1
1 ⟵ $\mathfrak{F}_{1,1}(1)$ ⟵ $\mathfrak{F}^2_{1,1}(1)$ ⟵ ⋯ $Z_1 \cong \mathfrak{F}_{1,1}(Z_1)$
1 ⟵ $\mathfrak{F}_{Z_1,Z_1}(1)$ ⟵ $\mathfrak{F}^2_{Z_1,Z_1}(1)$ ⟵ ⋯ $Z_2 \cong \mathfrak{F}_{Z_1,Z_1}(Z_2)$
1 ⟵ $\mathfrak{F}_{Z_2,Z_2}(1)$ ⟵ $\mathfrak{F}^2_{Z_2,Z_2}(1)$ ⟵ ⋯ $Z_3 \cong \mathfrak{F}_{Z_2,Z_2}(Z_3)$
1 ⟵ $\mathfrak{F}_{Z,Z}(1)$ ⟵ $\mathfrak{F}^2_{Z,Z}(1)$ ⟵ ⋯ $Z \cong \mathfrak{F}_{Z,Z}(Z)$

Figure 1: *Computing solutions to* (4) *by means of bi-chains.*

Intuitively, Lemma 3.8 says that solving (4) for the endofunctor or for its final coalgebra is essentially the same. In fact, we can define a symmetric endofunctor on $\mathbf{C}^{op} \times \mathbf{C}$ starting from $\mathfrak{F}$ and $|\nu - |$ and such that its initial algebra determines the initial algebra for $\breve{\mathfrak{F}}_\nu$ and *vice versa*, namely:

$$(|\nu - |^{op} \times |\nu - |) \circ \langle \mathfrak{F}^{op}, \mathfrak{F} \rangle.$$

We are now able to state the main result of this section, namely the existence of unique (up-to iso) dominating solutions to (4).

Theorem 3.9. *Assume* $\mathbf{C}$ **Cpo***-algebraically compact. For any* **Cpo***-enriched* $\mathfrak{F} : \mathbf{C}^{op} \times \mathbf{C} \to [\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{C}]$*,* (4) *admits a unique (up-to isomorphism) dominating solution.*

Proof. By Corollary 2.5 the category $\mathbf{C}^{op} \times \mathbf{C}$ is **Cpo**-algebraically compact. By Lemma 3.7, the symmetric endofunctor $\breve{\mathfrak{F}}_\nu$ is a **Cpo**-endofunctor. Since $\breve{\mathfrak{F}}_\nu$ factors through a **Cpo**-algebraically compact category it is possible to apply Lemma 3.8 and thus the initial $\breve{\mathfrak{F}}_\nu$-algebra and the final $\breve{\mathfrak{F}}_\nu$-coalgebra exists and are canonically isomorphic yielding, by symmetry, the required endofunctor B over $\mathbf{C}$. Finally, initiality/finality ensures that other solution necessarily factors the aforementioned canonical isomorphism and hence is dominated by B. □

The 2-categorical structure embodied by the order-enrichment is purely functional to achieving algebraic compactness. Indeed, any solution obtained in the settings of Theorem 3.9 yields a (ordinary) endofunctor solution to (4) where the the family of behavioural endofunctors considered is composed by any endofunctor underlying a **Cpo**-endofunctor described by $\mathfrak{F}$.

Corollary 3.10. *Assume* $\mathbf{C}$ **Cpo***-algebraically compact. For any* **Cpo***-enriched* $\mathfrak{F} : \mathbf{C}^{op} \times \mathbf{C} \to [\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{C}]$ *there exists a unique (up-to iso) dominating solution to* $B \cong \lfloor \lfloor \mathfrak{F} \rfloor (|\nu B|, |\nu B|) \rfloor$.

The proof of Theorem 3.9 is based on existence of initial and symmetric invariants for $\breve{\mathfrak{F}}_\nu$ and, under the assumption of Proposition 2.4, these can be computed via initial sequences for $\breve{\mathfrak{F}}_\nu$. By unfolding the sequence leading to such invariants we obtain the diagram illustrated in Fig. 1. Horizontal arrows form final sequences which in turn determine the final coalgebras to be used for instantiating the behavioural functor of the successive

iteration. Vertical arrows form chains of embedding-projection pairs and hence characterise horizontal layers as approximations converging to the limiting final sequence depicted in the bottom of the diagram. From this perspective, horizontal layers can be read as *finite-order* behaviours approximating the higher-order solution. In fact, the first row characterises the null-order *e.g.* base values, atoms *etc.* (recall that the final object in a slice category $\mathbf{C}\downarrow V$ is id_V); behaviours for $\mathfrak{F}(1,1)$ exchange base values and hence are first-order processes and so on. In general, behaviours for $\mathfrak{F}(Z_n, Z_n)$ exchange (abstract) behaviours of order n end hence belong to the order $n+1$. This ω-sequence is limited by higher-order behaviours.

3.3. Examples

Deterministic higher-order behaviours In Section 3.1 we considered as a running example the parameterised endofunctor $\mathfrak{F}(V,W) = \mathrm{Id}^V + W$ over **Set**. Since the cardinality of the set carrying the final $\mathfrak{F}(V,W)$-coalgebra always exceeds both $|V|$ and $|W|$ there are no solutions to (4). Behaviours characterised by this functor are closely related to the domain equation $D \cong (D \to D) + D$: this equation cannot be solved in **Set** but admits a unique dominating solution in $\mathbf{Cpo}_\perp$. This observation prompted us to study $\mathrm{Id}^V + W$ as an endofunctor over $\mathbf{Cpo}_\perp$.

Let $(X \to_\perp Y)$ denote the space of continuous bottom-strict functions ordered pointwise and consider $\mathfrak{F}(V,W) = (V \to_\perp \mathrm{Id}) + W$. For any V and W, the final $\mathfrak{F}(V,W)$-coalgebra exists and determines all trees whose leaves are in W and whose branches are indexed (on each node) by continuous bottom-strict functions from V. Intuitively, bottom elements can be read as unresponsive behaviours like deadlocks and hence inputs modelled by $(V \to_\perp \mathrm{Id})$ force a system to deadlock whenever it inputs $\perp_V$. Behaviours that deadlock on any input or terminate with output $\perp$ coincide for coproducts are strict. Thus, $\mathfrak{F}(V,W)$ captures eager deterministic computations.

Since the functor $\mathfrak{F}$ is **Cpo**-enriched and $\mathbf{Cpo}_\perp$ is **Cpo**-algebraically compact we conclude by Theorem 3.9 that there exists an endofunctor in $\mathfrak{F}$ solution to Definition 3.6 and that it can be computed as the limit of the sequence depicted in Fig. 1. The fixed point is reached after the first iteration for $1 \cong |\mathfrak{F}(1,1)|$. Indeed, 1 solves $D \cong (D \to_\perp D) + D$ in $\mathbf{Cpo}_\perp$.

Inspired by the intuitive correlation with domain equations, consider $\mathfrak{F}(V,W) = (V \to_\perp \mathrm{Id}) + W + A$ where $A \neq 1$. Computations are strict as before but now behaviours can terminate returning an atom from A. Theorem 3.9 applies also to this family of endofunctors but (thanks to $A \neq 1$) the sequence leading to B contains countably many iterations. Intuitively, abstract behaviours described by the final B-coalgebra of are trees with atoms and abstract behaviours as leaves and children indexed by abstract behaviours provided such indexing respect continuity and strictness.

The functors described above are examples of polynomial functors parameterised by (V,W) like those generated by the following simple grammar:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{F}_i(V,W) ::= {} & (X \to_\perp \mathrm{Id}) \mid X \mid (V \to_\perp \mathrm{Id}) \mid W \mid \\ & \mathfrak{F}_1(V,W) + \mathfrak{F}_2(V,W) \mid \\ & \mathfrak{F}_1(V,W) \times \mathfrak{F}_2(V,W)\end{aligned}$$

All these functors meet the hypotheses of Theorem 3.9.

Non-deterministic higher-order behaviours Bounded non-determinism is modelled in the context of **Set** by means of the bounded powerset functor $\mathcal{P}_\omega$. Families of behavioural endofunctors of practical interest and based on $\mathcal{P}_\omega$ hardly contain endofunctors modelling higher-order behaviours. For instance, (4) does not admit any solution when instantiated to (3). Thus, we model non-deterministic higher-order computations in $\mathbf{Cpo}_\perp$.

Let $\mathbb{B}$ be the boolean lattice. For a map $\phi : X \to \mathbb{B}$ in $\mathbf{Cpo}_\perp$, the subset $\phi^{-1}(\top)$ of X is upward closed and does not contain $\perp$ (ϕ is monotone and bottom-strict); these subsets of X are equivalent to $\mathbf{Cpo}_\perp(X,\mathbb{B})$. Likewise, $\mathbf{Cpo}(X,\mathbb{B})$ determines all upward closed subsets of X since a map $\phi : X \to \mathbb{B}$ in **Cpo** may map $\perp_X$ to $\top$. If the order on $X \in \mathbf{Cpo}$ is the anti-chain ordering then any subset of X is trivially upward closed. In fact, the endofunctor $(\mathrm{Id} \to \mathbb{B})$ over **Cpo** yields $\mathcal{P}$ by composition with the forgetful functor $U : \mathbf{Cpo} \to \mathbf{Set}$ and with the insertion functor $I : \mathbf{Set} \to \mathbf{Cpo}$ (which equips each set with the anti-chain ordering). Finally, note that $(\mathrm{Id} \to \mathbb{B}) : \mathbf{Cpo} \to \mathbf{Cpo}$ restricts to $\mathbf{Cpo}_\perp$. Thus, $(\mathrm{Id} \to \mathbb{B})$ is a good candidate for modelling non-determinism in the contexts of **Cpo** and $\mathbf{Cpo}_\perp$.

Both $(\mathrm{Id} \to_\perp \mathbb{B})$ and $(\mathrm{Id} \to \mathbb{B})$ are **Cpo**-endofunctors over $\mathbf{Cpo}_\perp$; their final coalgebras are carried by 1 and ω, respectively. This difference reflects the kind of non-deterministic behaviours captured by the two endofunctors. In the first case, a coalgebra can either map a state to the empty set or to some upset that does not contain the bottom element for these are described by strict functions to $\mathbb{B}$—reworded, behaviours are either stuck or able to proceed in a non-deterministic fashion. In the second case, a coalgebra can map a state to any upset meaning that behaviours may get stuck at any time, non-deterministically.

Higher-order CCS The late semantics of the CCS with values has been shown in [13] to be captured by the (parameterised) endofunctor (1) over **Set**. However, there is no set of values such that the resulting endofunctor meets the condition in Definition 3.6. Akin to the previous examples, we move from **Set** to $\mathbf{Cpo}_\perp$ in order to define endofunctors modelling non-deterministic processes that synchronously exchange values along the lines of (1).

Fix two objects V and C for values and channels, respectively. Deterministic outputs over channels are characterised by the endofunctor $C \times V \times \mathrm{Id}$. Deterministic inputs are described by the endofunctor $C \times (V \to \mathrm{Id})$. Note that the function space includes also non-strict functions meaning that receiving $\perp$ does not force a system to deadlock—we are interested in the late interpretation of value passing. The non-deterministic component of the behaviour is provided by the "strict upset" endofunctor $\mathcal{U}_\perp = (\mathrm{Id} \to_\perp \mathbb{B})$ since this choice ensures that a process is either stuck or can non-deterministically perform an output, an input, or a silent action. By combining these elements we obtain the family of endofunctors:

$$\mathfrak{F}(V,W) = \mathcal{U}_\perp(\overbrace{C \times W \times \mathrm{Id}}^{\text{output}} + \overbrace{C \times (V \to \mathrm{Id})}^{\text{input}} + \overbrace{\mathrm{Id}}^{\tau}).$$

By construction, $\mathfrak{F}$ is **Cpo**-enriched and, by Theorem 3.9, there is an endofunctor modelling higher-order systems.

4. Lifted and dropped solutions

By inspecting the diagram shown in Fig. 1 it is clear that limit-colimit coincidence is required only to ensure sequences of embedding-projection pairs are limited. Reworded, only the category of parameters is required to be algebraically compact. In Section 3 parameters and behaviours are modelled in the same category but this observation suggest the possibility of considering functors of type $\mathbf{D}^{\mathrm{op}} \times \mathbf{D} \to [\mathbf{C},\mathbf{C}]$ where only $\mathbf{D}$ is assumed algebraically compact. Although this result may appear mainly technical, it allows us to cover a wider class of behaviours since it may often be useful, if not outright necessary,

to model parameters and behaviours in different categories in order to simplify the computations of Theorem 3.9 or to cover behaviours not expressible as functors of type $\mathbf{C}^{\mathrm{op}} \times \mathbf{C} \to [\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{C}]$. For instance, behavioural endofunctors might be defined on a (suitably enriched) category of spaces whereas parameters are restricted to range over its subcategory of exponentiable ones. Likewise, one might consider the Kleisli category for a monad and its underlying category—along the lines of [35].

The first challenge in characterise endofunctors in $\mathfrak{F} \colon \mathbf{D}^{\mathrm{op}} \times \mathbf{D} \to [\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{C}]$ that model higher-order behaviours is that the categories where we model systems and exchanged behaviours are distinct. Since higher-order behaviours are meant to operate on behaviours of the same type, we need a way to mediate between their representations in $\mathbf{D}$ and $\mathbf{C}$. Intuitively, this means that although systems are modelled as coalgebras for endofunctors over $\mathbf{C}$, their abstract behaviours (*i.e.* semantics) "live" in $\mathbf{D}$. To this end, we consider behavioural endofunctors with a "counterpart" over the category of parameters and some functor between the involved categories that "mediates" their behaviours.

4.1. Families of lifted endofunctors

Here we assume to be given a functor $R \colon \mathbf{D} \to \mathbf{C}$ to act as mediator for behaviours and behavioural endofunctors—the exact meaning of this intuition will be formalised shortly.

An endofunctor $G \in [\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{C}]$ is said to be *lifted* along R if there is an endofunctor $H \in [\mathbf{D}, \mathbf{D}]$ such that $R \circ H \cong G \circ R$. In order to generalise this condition beyond objects in $[\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{C}]$ and $[\mathbf{D}, \mathbf{D}]$ consider the following 2-pullback:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{P} & \xrightarrow{p_2} & [\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{C}] \\ {\scriptstyle p_1}\downarrow & \cong & \downarrow{\scriptstyle (-\circ R)} \\ [\mathbf{D}, \mathbf{D}] & \xrightarrow[(R \circ -)]{} & [\mathbf{D}, \mathbf{C}] \end{array}$$

Then, the projection of $\mathbf{P}$ on $[\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{C}]$ defines the category of endofunctors lifted along R. Formally, we define $\mathbf{Lift}_R$ as the replete image[3] of p_2:

$$\mathbf{Lift}_R \cong \underline{\mathrm{img}}(p_2).$$

This definition extends to the $\mathbf{V}$-enriched setting as it is. In particular, for R a $\mathbf{V}$-functor, $\mathbf{Lift}_R$ is the sub-$\mathbf{V}$-category of $[\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{C}]$ formed by all

- G s.t. for some $H \in [\mathbf{D}, \mathbf{D}]$, $R \circ H \cong G \circ R$ in $[\mathbf{D}, \mathbf{C}]$;
- $g \colon G \to G'$ s.t., for some $h \colon H \to H'$ in $[\mathbf{D}, \mathbf{D}]$, $Rh \cong gR$ in $[\mathbf{D}, \mathbf{C}]$ (*i.e.* $\psi \circ Rh \circ \phi = g_R$ for $\phi \colon R \circ H \cong G \circ R$ and $\psi \colon R \circ H' \cong G \circ R'$);
- $g \leqslant g'$ s.t., for some $h \leqslant h' \in [\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{C}]$, $Rh \cong gR$ and $Rh' \cong g'R$.

In this situation R plays the rôle of a mediator between lifted and dropped endofunctors and hence between the behaviours they model. This suggests the following conservative extension of (4) to functors of type $\mathbf{D}^{\mathrm{op}} \times \mathbf{D} \to [\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{C}]$:

$$\begin{cases} G \cong \mathfrak{F}(|\nu H|, |\nu H|) \\ R \circ H \cong G \circ R \end{cases} \tag{5}$$

where, although the equation systems presents two unknowns, we are actually interested only in G for its values are the endofunctors modelling the systems under scrutiny. However, (5) does not offer any correlation between the final coalgebras of G and H that is strong enough for the aims of this work. In fact, for G lifting of H we have that the image through R of the final H-coalgebra (canonically) extends to a G-coalgebra but not to the final one as illustrated by the diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} |\nu G| & & \xrightarrow{\quad\nu G\quad} & & G|\nu G| \\ {\scriptstyle \psi}\uparrow & & & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle G\psi} \\ R|\nu H| & \xrightarrow{\nu H} & RH|\nu H| & \xrightarrow{\phi_{|\nu H|}} & GR|\nu H| \end{array} \tag{6}$$

where $\phi \colon R \circ H \cong G \circ R$ is the natural isomorphism witnessing G as a lifting of H. To this end, we need to assume $\psi \colon R|\nu H| \to |\nu G|$ from above to be an isomorphism or, equivalently, $R|\nu H| \cong |\nu G|$ in $\mathbf{C}$. In such case we say that final invariants lift along the mediator R. Formally:

Definition 4.1. For $R \colon \mathbf{D} \to \mathbf{C}$ we say that *final invariants lift along* R whenever

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & [\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{C}] & \xrightarrow{|\nu - |} & \mathbf{C} \\ & \nearrow & & \searrow{\scriptstyle (-\circ R)} & \\ \mathbf{P} & \cong & [\mathbf{D}, \mathbf{C}] & \cong & \uparrow{\scriptstyle R} \\ & \searrow & & \nearrow{\scriptstyle (R \circ -)} & \\ & & [\mathbf{D}, \mathbf{D}] & \xrightarrow[|\nu - |]{} & \mathbf{D} \end{array}$$

Under such conditions, R mediates all abstract behaviours between lifted and dropped endofunctors thus providing the bridge between the category $\mathbf{C}$ (where systems are modelled) and the category $\mathbf{D}$ (where parameters range) required to capture the fact that higher-order behaviours operate on behaviours of the same kind. This is captured by extending (5) as follows:

$$\begin{cases} G \cong \mathfrak{F}(|\nu H|, |\nu H|) \\ R \circ H \cong G \circ R \\ R|\nu H| \cong |\nu G| \end{cases} \tag{7}$$

Then, Definition 3.6 generalises to this setting as follows:

Definition 4.2. For $\mathfrak{F} \colon \mathbf{D}^{\mathrm{op}} \times \mathbf{D} \to [\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{C}]$, $G \colon \mathbf{C} \to \mathbf{C}$ is said to characterise higher-order behaviours in $\mathfrak{F}$ if, and only if, there is $H \colon \mathbf{D} \to \mathbf{D}$ such that they are solutions to (7).

Note that (5) coincides with (7) Under the assumption that final invariants lift along R meaning that we can move some of the information from the equation system to the hypothesis. This simplification is crucial to our aim of obtaining solutions to (7) as invariants of suitable endofunctors along the lines of Section 3. Henceforth, we assume R such that final invariants lifts along it. We remark that this holds for any functor preserving final sequences and, in particular, for any right **Cpo**-adjoint:

Lemma 4.3. *Final invariants lift along right* **Cpo***-adjoints.*

Proof. The statement can be proved along the lines of Peter J. Freyd's "reflective subcategory lemma" [14]. □

Assume, for the argument sake, that there exists an assignment mapping each $G \in \mathbf{Lift}_R$ to a chosen $\overline{G} \in [\mathbf{D}, \mathbf{D}]$ lifting to G. Then, we can reformulate (5) as follows:

$$G \cong \mathfrak{F}(|\nu \overline{G}|, |\nu \overline{G}|). \tag{8}$$

Since both (7) and (5) impose solutions to satisfy the lifting condition we can restrict, without loss of generality, to functors of type $\mathbf{D}^{\mathrm{op}} \times \mathbf{D} \to \mathbf{Lift}_R$. Assume that above assignment extends to a functor $\overline{(-)} \colon \mathbf{Lift}_R \to [\mathbf{D}, \mathbf{D}]$, then we can obtain solutions to (8)

[3] A subcategory $\mathbf{D}$ of $\mathbf{C}$ is *replete* if for any $f \in \mathbf{D}$ and $f \cong g$ in the arrow category $\mathbf{C}^{\to}$, then $g \in \mathbf{D}$ or, equivalently, if the inclusion $\mathbf{D} \to \mathbf{C}$ is an isofibration The replete image of a functor $F \colon \mathbf{C} \to \mathbf{D}$ is the repletion the image of F.

as invariants by applying the approach described in Section 3.2 to the functor:

$$\mathbf{D}^{\mathrm{op}} \times \mathbf{D} \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{F}} \mathbf{Lift}_R \xrightarrow{(\overline{-})} [\mathbf{D}, \mathbf{D}]. \tag{9}$$

In general, there might be no (functorial) assignment $(\overline{-})$ but there might be several as well. In the latter case, we remark that they are all equivalent under the assumption that final invariants lift along the mediating functor. In fact, the following holds:



where the inclusion I is given by construction of $\mathbf{Lift}_R$. If R is 2-monic[4], then any endofunctor in $\mathbf{Lift}_R$ is the lifting of a unique (up-to isomorphism) endofunctor:

Lemma 4.4. *For R 2-monic, the diagram below commutes:*



Proof. The functor $(R \circ -)$ is 2-monic since, by hypothesis, R is so. By construction, $p_2 : \mathbf{P} \to [\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{C}]$ is 2-monic and thus $\mathbf{P}$ is $\mathbf{Lift}_R$. The desired $(\overline{-})$ is p_1. □

Therefore, (5) can be solved by applying the techniques presented in Section 3 to $\overline{\mathfrak{F}} : \mathbf{D}^{\mathrm{op}} \times \mathbf{D} \to [\mathbf{D}, \mathbf{D}]$.

Theorem 4.5. *Assume* **D** **Cpo**-*algebraically compact,* $R : \mathbf{D} \to \mathbf{C}$ *2-monic in* **Cpo-Cat**, *and final invariants to lift along* R. *For any* **Cpo**-*functor* $\mathfrak{F} : \mathbf{D}^{\mathrm{op}} \times \mathbf{D} \to \mathbf{Lift}_R$ *the equation system* (5) *admits a unique dominating solution.*

Proof. Apply Theorem 3.9 to $\overline{\mathfrak{F}} : \mathbf{D}^{\mathrm{op}} \times \mathbf{D} \to [\mathbf{D}, \mathbf{D}]$ which exists by Lemma 4.4. □

Example: lazy deterministic behaviours Let **C** and **D** be **Cpo** and $\mathbf{Cpo}_\perp$, respectively, and let $R : \mathbf{D} \to \mathbf{C}$ be the inclusion $\mathbf{Cpo}_\perp \to \mathbf{Cpo}$ whose left **Cpo**-adjoint is the lifting functor $(-)_\perp : \mathbf{Cpo} \to \mathbf{Cpo}_\perp$.

The endofunctor $((V \to \mathrm{Id}) + W)_\perp$ over $\mathbf{Cpo}_\perp$ lifts to **Cpo** along R as it is. The outer lifting functor $(-)_\perp$ creates a bottom associated with the system being stuck. The function space functor $(V \to \mathrm{Id})$ describes lazy inputs since these functions are not strict. Finally, the constant functor W models behaviours terminating producing an output in a lazy fashion since the bottom element of W is distinct from the one provided by $(-)_\perp$. Finally, the assignment $(V, W) \mapsto ((V \to \mathrm{Id}) + W)_\perp$ determines a **Cpo**-functor $\mathfrak{F} : \mathbf{Cpo}_\perp{}^{\mathrm{op}} \times \mathbf{Cpo}_\perp \to \mathbf{Lift}_R$ allowing us to apply Theorem 4.5 and obtain the dominating endofunctor among those in $\mathfrak{F}$ that model lazy deterministic higher-order behaviours.

4.2. Families of dropped endofunctors

In this section we assume the same settings of Section 4.1 except for R going in the opposite direction. Because the mediating functor R is reversed, we have to consider dropped endofunctors have and "symmetrise" all constructions presented in Section 4.1.

[4] A morphism f in a 2-category is said to be 2-monic provided that $f \circ g \cong f \circ h \implies g \cong h$.

As above, we define endofunctors modelling higher-order behaviours by a conservative extension of Definition 3.6 and show that such endofunctors exists and can be computed as limits of sequences akin to those we used so far.

The category $\mathbf{Drop}_R$ of endofunctors *dropped* along $R : \mathbf{C} \to \mathbf{D}$ is defined, symmetrically to $\mathbf{Lift}_R$, as the replete image of the projection $p_1 : \mathbf{P} \to [\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{C}]$ from the 2-pullback:



This definition extends to the **V**-enriched setting as it is. In particular, for R a **V**-functor, $\mathbf{Drop}_R$ is the sub-**V**-category of $[\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{C}]$ formed by all

- H s.t. for some $G \in [\mathbf{D}, \mathbf{D}]$, $R \circ H \cong G \circ R$ in $[\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{D}]$;
- $h : H \to H'$ s.t., for some $g : G \to G'$ in $[\mathbf{D}, \mathbf{D}]$, $Rh \cong gR$ in $[\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{D}]$ (*i.e.* $\psi \circ Rh \circ \phi = g_R$ for $\phi : R \circ H \cong G \circ R$ and $\psi : R \circ H' \cong G \circ R$);
- $h \leqslant h'$ s.t., for some $g \leqslant g' \in [\mathbf{D}, \mathbf{D}]$, $Rh \cong gR$ and $Rh' \cong g'R$.

The functor R has to mediate all abstract behaviours between lifted and dropped endofunctors in the sense that, for G lifting of H, the image through R of the final G-coalgebra (canonically) extends to the final G-coalgebra (see (6)). Formally:

Definition 4.6. For $R : \mathbf{C} \to \mathbf{D}$ we say that *final invariants drop along* R whenever



Final invariants drop along functors that preserve final sequences and, in particular, along any right **Cpo**-adjoint:

Lemma 4.7. *Final invariants drop along right* **Cpo**-*adjoints.*

Proof. The statement can be proved along the lines of Peter J. Freyd's "reflective subcategory lemma" [14]. □

Akin to (7), (4) generalises to $\mathfrak{F} : \mathbf{D}^{\mathrm{op}} \times \mathbf{D} \to [\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{C}]$ as:

$$\begin{cases} H \cong \mathfrak{F}(|\nu G|, |\nu G|) \\ R \circ H \cong G \circ R \\ R|\nu H| \cong |\nu G| \end{cases} \tag{10}$$

where we are actually interested only in the unknown H for its values are the endofunctors modelling the systems under scrutiny. Definition 3.6 generalises to this setting as follows:

Definition 4.8. For $\mathfrak{F} : \mathbf{D}^{\mathrm{op}} \times \mathbf{D} \to \mathbf{Drop}_R$, an endofunctor is said to characterise higher-order behaviours in $\mathfrak{F}$ if, and only if, it is solution to (10).

When final invariants drop along R and ($\mathfrak{F}$ restricts to $\mathbf{Drop}_R$), (10) can be reformulated in the unknown H alone yielding:

$$H \cong \mathfrak{F}(R|\nu H|, R|\nu H|). \tag{11}$$

This equation determines the functor

$$\mathbf{C}^{\mathrm{op}} \times \mathbf{C} \xrightarrow{R^{\mathrm{op}} \times R} \mathbf{D}^{\mathrm{op}} \times \mathbf{D} \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{F}} [\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{C}] \tag{12}$$

and, although its type is the one considered in Section 3, we cannot apply Theorem 3.9 since here we do not assume $\mathbf{C}$ $\mathbf{Cpo}$-algebraically compact. Therefore, we need to capture (10) in terms of endofunctors over $\mathbf{D}$.

Akin Section 4.1, given a functorial assignment choosing liftings for endofunctors dropped along R, we reformulate (10) as:

$$\begin{cases} H \cong \mathfrak{F}(|\nu\overline{H}|, |\nu\overline{H}|) \\ R|\nu H| \cong |\nu\overline{H}| \end{cases}$$

and, since final invariants drop along R, as:

$$G \cong \overline{\mathfrak{F}}(|\nu G|, |\nu G|)$$

which in turn provides us with the desired formulation of (10) in terms of endofunctors over $\mathbf{D}$. Solutions can be characterised as invariants of a suitable endofunctor by applying the approach described in Section 3.2 to the functor:

$$\mathbf{D}^{\mathrm{op}} \times \mathbf{D} \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{F}} \mathbf{Drop}_R \xrightarrow{(\overline{-})} [\mathbf{D}, \mathbf{D}].$$

All considerations from Section 4.1 about the existence of an assignment $(\overline{-})$ apply to this setting. In particular, under the dual hypothesis of Lemma 4.4, there is a unique functor $(\overline{-})$:

Lemma 4.9. *For R 2-epic, the diagram below commutes:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{Drop}_R & \overset{(\overline{-})}{\dashrightarrow} & [\mathbf{D}, \mathbf{D}] \\ \downarrow & \cong & \downarrow{\scriptstyle (- \circ R)} \\ [\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{C}] & \xrightarrow[(R \circ -)]{} & [\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{D}] \end{array}$$

Proof. The functor $(- \circ R)$ is 2-monic since, by hypothesis, R is 2-epic. By construction, $p_1 : \mathbf{P} \to [\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{C}]$ is 2-monic and thus $\mathbf{P}$ is $\mathbf{Drop}_R$. The desired $(\overline{-})$ is p_1. □

The approach discussed so far corresponds to the upper path of the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & [\mathbf{D}, \mathbf{D}] & \xrightarrow{|\nu -|} & \mathbf{D} \\ & & {\scriptstyle (\overline{-})}\uparrow & \cong & \uparrow{\scriptstyle R} \\ \mathbf{D}^{\mathrm{op}} \times \mathbf{D} & \xrightarrow[\mathfrak{F}]{} & \mathbf{Drop}_R & \xrightarrow[|\nu -|]{} & \mathbf{C} \end{array}$$

Since the diagram commutes (final invariants drop along R by assumption), any solution obtained applying Theorem 3.9 to $\overline{\mathfrak{F}}$ can be determined also as an invariant of the symmetric endofunctor over $\mathbf{D}^{\mathrm{op}} \times \mathbf{D}$ induced by the lower path. Crucially, the latter does not assume the existence of $(\overline{-})$.

Theorem 4.10. *Assume $\mathbf{D}$ $\mathbf{Cpo}$-algebraically compact and final invariants to drop along $R : \mathbf{C} \to \mathbf{D}$. For a $\mathbf{Cpo}$-functor $\mathfrak{F} : \mathbf{D}^{\mathrm{op}} \times \mathbf{D} \to \mathbf{Drop}_R$, (11) admits a unique (up-to iso) dominating solution.*

Proof. Let $\check{\mathfrak{F}}$ denote the symmetric $\mathbf{Cpo}$-enriched endofunctor over $\mathbf{D}^{\mathrm{op}} \times \mathbf{D}$ induced by $R \circ |\nu -| \circ \mathfrak{F} : \mathbf{D}^{\mathrm{op}} \times \mathbf{D} \to \mathbf{D}$. By Corollary 2.5 is $\mathbf{D}^{\mathrm{op}} \times \mathbf{D}$ $\mathbf{Cpo}$-algebraically compact and hence both the initial $\check{\mathfrak{F}}$-algebra and final $\check{\mathfrak{F}}$-coalgebra exists and are isomorphic yielding, by symmetry $Z \in \mathbf{D}$ s.t. $H = \mathfrak{F}(Z, Z)$ is the desired dominating solution to (11). □

5. Conclusions and future work

In this paper we have showed how to define behaviours of higher-order systems as final coalgebras of suitable behavioural functors. To this end, we had to solve an intrinsic circularity between the definition of these functors, and their own final coalgebra. We have provided a general construction for both the functors and the final coalgebra, based on a limit-colimit coincidence argument. Thus, the final coalgebra of such a functor is the object of all abstract higher-order behaviours. As a direct application of the theory of coalgebras, we are now able to define a canonical higher-order coalgebraic bisimulation and show it to coincide with coalgebraic bisimulation for value-passing behaviours. This allows us to employ techniques developed for the seconds (*e.g.* [19]) to the higher-order case.

These results allow us to contextualize higher-order systems within the general framework of coalgebraic semantics, thus bridging the gap between the two worlds. It is interesting future work to investigate the application of results from coalgebras, to higher-order systems. In particular, we expect to be able to define general *higher-order trace equivalences* and *higher-order weak bisimulations* by applying the constructions given in [6,7,17,26].

This work sheds some light on the very nature of higher-order behaviour. In fact, there is no general consensus on a *criterium* for deciding when a calculus is "higher-order". We think that a calculus which is capable to "deal" with its own processes via some encoding should not be considered really higher-order, as much as first-order logic is not considered on a par with higher-order logic. The results presented in this paper suggest that *a calculus has an higher-order behaviour if its behavioural functor is defined in terms of its own final coalgebra*. According to this *criterium*, λ-calculus, CHOCS, HOπ, are higher-order, while CCS, π-calculus, Ambient calculus are not. Indeed there are encodings of higher-order calculi in first-order ones (see *e.g.* [33] for an encoding from λ-calculus to π-calculus) suggesting that their targets "have higher-order semantics". Nonetheless, these encodings do not reflect strong bisimulations but only weaker notions that hide auxiliary steps introduced by the encoding.

To our knowledge, this is the first general construction of syntax-independent functors for higher-order behaviours. Many authors have studied labelled transition systems and bisimulations for higher-order calculi (*e.g.*, "applicative", "environmental", *etc.*); see [1,24,31,32,39] among others. However, these approaches are tied to the syntactic presentations of specific languages, with no abstract definition of higher-order behaviours. Instead, our work achieves a clear separation between syntax and semantics, which can thus be covered within the bialgebraic theory of SOS specifications [21,40].

The diagram shown in Fig. 1 suggests that horizontal layers characterise behaviours approximating higher-order ones. From this perspective, an higher-order behaviour is uniquely defined by countable family of finite-order approximations. We plan to investigate this construction in the context of $\mathbf{C}$-valued sheaves over the downward topology on the first transfinite ordinal ω. When $\mathbf{C}$ is $\mathbf{Set}$, this category is the well-known topos of trees [5]. Since the topology considered has a well-founded base, we would be able to work on higher-order behaviours by inductive arguments on their finite-order approximations.

References

[1] S. Abramsky. The lazy lambda calculus. *Research topics in functional programming*, pages 65–116, 1990.

[2] P. Aczel and N. Mendler. A final coalgebra theorem. In D. H. Pitt, D. E. Rydeheard, P. Dybjer, A. M. Pitts, and A. Poigné, editors,

Proc. CTCS, volume 389 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 357–365. Springer, 1989.

[3] G. Bacci and M. Miculan. Structural operational semantics for continuous state stochastic transition systems. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 81(5):834–858, 2015.

[4] H. Barendregt. *The lambda calculus: its syntax and its semantics*. Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics. North-Holland, 1984.

[5] L. Birkedal, R. E. Møgelberg, J. Schwinghammer, and K. Støvring. First steps in synthetic guarded domain theory: step-indexing in the topos of trees. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, 8(4), 2012.

[6] T. Brengos, M. Miculan, and M. Peressotti. Behavioural equivalences for coalgebras with unobservable moves. *Journal of Logical and Algebraic Methods in Programming*, 84(6):826–852, 2015.

[7] T. Brengos and M. Peressotti. A uniform framework for timed automata. In *CONCUR*, volume 59 of *LIPIcs*, pages 26:1–26:14. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2016.

[8] G. L. Cattani, M. P. Fiore, and G. Winskel. A theory of recursive domains with applications to concurrency. In *Proc. LICS*, pages 214–225. IEEE Computer Society, 1998.

[9] R. De Nicola, G. Iacobelli, and M. Tribastone. Dimming relations for the efficient analysis of concurrent systems via action abstraction. In *FORTE*, volume 8461 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 216–231. Springer, 2014.

[10] E.-E. Doberkat. *Stochastic Coalgebraic Logic*. Springer, 2010.

[11] M. P. Fiore. *Axiomatic domain theory in categories of partial maps*, volume 14. Cambridge University Press, 2004.

[12] M. P. Fiore and S. Staton. Comparing operational models of name-passing process calculi. *Information and Computation*, 204(4):524–560, 2006.

[13] M. P. Fiore and D. Turi. Semantics of name and value passing. In *Proc. LICS*, pages 93–104. IEEE Computer Society, 2001.

[14] P. J. Freyd. Algebraically complete categories. In A. Carboni, M. Pedicchio, and G. Rosolini, editors, *Category Theory*, volume 1488 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, pages 95–104. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1991.

[15] P. J. Freyd. Remarks on algebraically compact categories. In *Applications of Categories in Computer Science: Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society Symposium*, volume 177, page 95. Cambridge University Press, 1992.

[16] J. Glimming. Parametric (co)iteration vs. primitive direcursion. In T. Mossakowski, U. Montanari, and M. Haveraaen, editors, *Proc. CALCO*, volume 4624 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 257–278. Springer, 2007.

[17] I. Hasuo, B. Jacobs, and A. Sokolova. Generic trace semantics via coinduction. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, 3(4), 2007.

[18] M. Hennessy and A. Ingólfsdóttir. A theory of communicating processes with value passing. *Information and Computation*, 107(2):202–236, 1993.

[19] M. Hennessy and H. Lin. Symbolic bisimulations. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 138(2):353–389, 1995.

[20] F. Honsell and M. Lenisa. Final semantics for untyped lambda-calculus. In M. Dezani-Ciancaglini and G. D. Plotkin, editors, *Proc. TLCA*, volume 902 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 249–265. Springer, 1995.

[21] B. Klin. Bialgebras for structural operational semantics: An introduction. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 412(38):5043–5069, 2011.

[22] B. Klin and V. Sassone. Structural operational semantics for stochastic and weighted transition systems. *Information and Computation*, 227:58–83, 2013.

[23] V. Koutavas, P. Blain Levy, and E. Sumii. From applicative to environmental bisimulation. *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science*, 276(0):215–235, 2011. Proc. MFPS.

[24] I. Lanese, J. A. Pérez, D. Sangiorgi, and A. Schmitt. On the expressiveness and decidability of higher-order process calculi. In *Proc. LICS*, pages 145–155. IEEE Computer Society, 2008.

[25] S. Lenglet, A. Schmitt, and J.-B. Stefani. Characterizing contextual equivalence in calculi with passivation. *Information and Computation*, 209(11):1390–1433, 2011.

[26] M. Miculan and M. Peressotti. Weak bisimulations for labelled transition systems weighted over semirings. *CoRR*, abs/1310.4106, 2013.

[27] M. Miculan and M. Peressotti. GSOS for non-deterministic processes with quantitative aspects. In N. Bertrand and L. Bortolussi, editors, *Proc. QAPL*, volume 154 of *Electronic Proceedings in Theoretical Computer Science*, pages 17–33. Open Publishing Association, 2014.

[28] M. Miculan and M. Peressotti. Structural operational semantics for non-deterministic processes with quantitative aspects. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 2016. Accepted.

[29] A. Piérard and E. Sumii. A higher-order distributed calculus with name creation. In *Proc. LICS*, pages 531–540. IEEE Computer Society, 2012.

[30] J. J. M. M. Rutten. Universal coalgebra: a theory of systems. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 249(1):3–80, 2000.

[31] D. Sangiorgi. Bisimulation for higher-order process calculi. *Information and Computation*, 131(2):141–178, 1996.

[32] D. Sangiorgi, N. Kobayashi, and E. Sumii. Environmental bisimulations for higher-order languages. In *Proc. LICS*, pages 293–302. IEEE Computer Society, 2007.

[33] D. Sangiorgi and D. Walker. *The π-calculus: a Theory of Mobile Processes*. Cambridge University Press, 2001.

[34] D. S. Scott. Continuous lattices. *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, 274:97–136, 1972.

[35] A. Simpson. Recursive types in kleisli categories. Working paper, University of Edinburgh, 1992.

[36] M. B. Smyth and G. D. Plotkin. The category-theoretic solution of recursive domain equations. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 11(4):761–783, 1982.

[37] A. Sokolova. Probabilistic systems coalgebraically: A survey. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 412(38):5095–5110, 2011.

[38] K. Støvring and S. B. Lassen. A complete, co-inductive syntactic theory of sequential control and state. In *Semantics and algebraic specification*, pages 329–375. Springer, 2009.

[39] B. Thomsen. Plain CHOCS: a second generation calculus for higher order processes. *Acta informatica*, 30(1):1–59, 1993.

[40] D. Turi and G. Plotkin. Towards a mathematical operational semantics. In *Proc. LICS*, pages 280–291. IEEE Computer Society, 1997.